

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-31, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62, and 66 are pending and under consideration.

### Objection to Claims 8-31

On page 9, the Office Action indicates that claims 8-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, claims 8-31 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As indicated below, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, claim 8 does not depend upon a rejected base claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62, and 66 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 7, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,819,550 issued to Jobs et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Jobs '550") in view of U. S. Design Patent No. D489,370 issued to Jobs et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Jobs '370"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Jobs '550 and Jobs '370, taken separately or in combination, does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a first auxiliary link member disposed parallel to the lower link member at a first position deviated from first axes of the link hinge and the base hinge to ...transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the upper link member through the link hinge," as recited in claim 1.

On page 3, the Office Action states,

"Jobs '550 does not specifically teach providing both a lower link member and an upper link member, as well as a link hinge provided between the upper link member and the lower link member to connect the upper link member to the [lower] link member, to rotate upper link member relative to the lower link member, and to transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base to the upper link member through the link hinge.

Jobs '370 discloses a design for a display device with a movable assembly (see Figs. 2, 4, 6, and 10), including both a lower link member (not numbered), an upper link member (not numbered), and a link hinge (not numbered) provided between the upper link member and the lower link member."

Because Jobs '550 only discloses a single link member 3402 (Figures 34 and 35 of Jobs '550), output link 3412 of Jobs '550 can not "transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the upper link member through the link hinge," as recited in claim

1. In addition, col. 1, lines 19-28 of Jobs '550 indicates that support devices with multiple hinges prove difficult to adjust, and routing of power cables along exterior portions of the devices mar aesthetic appearances. Therefore, Jobs '550 teaches away from a combination with a device with hinges such as a monitor hinge or link hinge. Accordingly, the argument for combining Jobs '550 and Jobs '370 provided in the Office Action is respectfully traversed. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 2-7 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Similarly, Jobs '550 and Jobs '370, taken separately or in combination, does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a link hinge rotatably coupled between the upper link member and the lower link member...; and a first auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member and another end rotatably coupled to the upper link member," as recited in claim 36. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 36 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 33-35, 37-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60, and 61 depend from claim 36 and include all of the features of claim 36. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claims 33-35, 37-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60, and 61 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Similarly, Jobs '550 and Jobs '370, taken separately or in combination, does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a link hinge rotatably coupled between the upper link member and the lower link member to move the monitor main body with respect to the base member, wherein the monitor main body forms a main angle with the base member according to movements of the lower and upper link members; a first auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member and another end rotatably coupled to the upper link member; a second auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the base member and another end rotatably coupled to the link hinge; and a third auxiliary link member having one end rotatably coupled to the link hinge and another end rotatably coupled to the monitor main body," as recited in claim 62. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 62 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Similarly, Jobs '550 and Jobs '370, taken separately or in combination, does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least, "a link hinge provided between the upper link member and the lower link member to allow the upper link member to rotate relative to the lower link member; and a first auxiliary link member disposed parallel to the lower link member at a first position deviated

from first axes of the link hinge and the base hinge to connect the lower link member with the upper link member through the link hinge and transmit a rotary motion from the lower link member relative to the base member to the upper link member through the link hinge,” as recited in claim 66. Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 66 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 3-6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jobs '550 in view of Jobs '370, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,951 issued to Takahashi et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Takahashi”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Jobs '550, Jobs '370, and Takahashi, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, suggest at least, “a base bracket combined to the base member to install the base member onto an inclined plane, wherein the base bracket comprises at least one hook, and the base member comprises at least one hook hole receiving the hook to latch the base bracket to detachably combine the base bracket to the base member,” as recited in claim 3.

Applicant respectfully submits that the field of use of monitors and display stands for monitors is different from the field of use of low profile telephone sets used as a table type model or as a wall mount-type model. For example, Applicant respectfully notes that Takashi is classified by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office under classification 379, which is different from the classification of Jobs '550 under 361 and 248 and Jobs '370 under D14/371 and D14/337.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Summary

Claims 1-31, 33-39, 41-47, 49-58, 60-62, and 66 are pending and under consideration. It is respectfully submitted that none of the references taken alone or in combination disclose the present claimed invention.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.


Serial No. 10/671,605

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 27, 2007

By:   
Paul F. Daebeler  
Registration No. 35,852

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501